DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 914 95 TM 007 228

AUTHOR Monaghan, Anne Coolidge
TITLE A Consideration of the Feasibility of a National Study of the Impact of Follow Through on the Public School System. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Huron Inst., Cambridge, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Follow Through.
PUB DATE Jul 76
CONTRACT OEC-0-74-0394
NOTE 65p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Behavior Change; Changing Attitudes; Compensatory Education Programs; Demonstration Projects; Educational Alternatives; *Educational Innovation; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; *Feasibility Studies; Intergroup Relations; Pilot Projects; Primary Education; *Program Attitudes; *Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; *Public School Systems; Public School Teachers; School Environment; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

To clarify the relationship between an educational innovation and its setting, a pilot study was conducted in three schools which housed the Follow Through Program. Personal interviews were conducted with approximately fifteen Follow Through and non-Follow Through administrators, teachers, and associates who had some contact with the program. Follow Through had some impact on its setting and vice versa; moreover, there were effects not fully attributable to either which apparently were created by a reciprocal relationship between the school system and Follow Through. The program modeled an alternative set of procedures, decisions, relationships, and values which were enacted by a staff whose beliefs, values and training were different from the regular staff. The setting had at least as much impact on Follow Through as Follow Through had on the setting because the school system defined work conditions, and because as a parent body it incorporated a smaller enterprise (Follow Through) and eventually diluted it. Results indicated that a national study can and should be conducted to define the relationship between extent and kind of site vs. innovation differences, and the impact of site and innovation on each other with emphasis on these areas: hiring qualifications, job definition, models of learning, and of decision making. The most pervasive impact of Follow Through was its catalytic function--its sheer existence encouraged revision and change, neither of which are easily generated internally. The Bank Street Check List for implementation of a model program is appended. (CP)

ED157914

Final Report

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TM PS
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

A Consideration of the Feasibility of a National Study of the Impact of Follow Through on the Public School System.

By

Anne Coolidge Monaghan
July 1976

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Huron Institute
119 Mt. Auburn Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Prepared for:
The Office of Education
Follow Through Evaluation Branch
Contract No. OEC-0-74-0394

TM007 228

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	WHAT IS THE FEASIBILITY OF A NATIONAL STUDY OF FOLLOW THROUGH IMPACT?	1
	A. Defining the Question	1
	B. A Brief History of Follow Through in Oxford	5
	C. Selection of A Case Study Method	7
II.	THE STORY OF DANTON	10
	A. An Introduction to Danton	10
	B. The Setting	13
	C. Themes in Interviews	15
	D. What Was the Impact of Follow Through on the School System in the Pilot Community?	23
	E. The Bigger Half: The System Has Impact on Follow Through	31
III.	DISCUSSION OF CONCLUSIONS	36

Appendix A: Bank Street Checklist

Appendix B: Essential Components

I. WHAT IS THE FEASIBILITY OF A NATIONAL STUDY OF FOLLOW THROUGH IMPACT?

A. Defining the Question

The Office of Education (OE) has had many years of experience with Follow Through (FT) and has made many attempts to analyze the achievement of the children in this program. These attempts have failed to find consistent reproducible long term achievement gains for large groups of children on conventional test measures. The Office of Education has naturally wondered if Follow Through models may have produced other kinds of effects which might be valuable to education.

This paper will explore that question. We realized that studying other effects of Follow Through left a large universe for investigation as effects could occur in relation to many groups: children, parents, teachers, administrators, ancillary school personnel, agencies, sponsors of the Follow Through models themselves, participating employees of OE and so on. In consultation with OE on previous studies of Follow Through effects we were permitted to narrow the scope of our research to an area which had formerly received little attention: the public school system.

We saw the system as possibly central to the existence of Follow Through. It was initially implicit in the Follow Through program that some of its models might be found generally more effective than the others. One could infer that these models would continue to be funded or subsidized beyond Follow Through's termination as a national program. Models might also continue simply because communities liked them regardless of their test performance and would be supported by local funding. In either case of continuance, we assumed that Follow Through would have to make or be able to make some impact

on the school system in order to begin and/or maintain a good working relationship with it.

If we were going to amend our question to ask "What is the feasibility of a national study of Follow Through impact on the school system?", this clearly eliminated agencies, sponsors and OE itself from our inquiry. We excluded children because adults were in the position of translating either to or "from" them. By stressing "system", we were trying to look for impact on groups rather than on individuals, and, we would be focusing on procedures, practices and policies at different levels in the system.

Our amended question was important in several ways. From a practical point of view it would be useful to know whether Follow Through had had any impact on systems, whether its strength or substance merited the investment made in the program. From a theoretical point of view it would be interesting to study the meeting of an innovation (Follow Through) with an educational enterprise already in place. Policy makers, school systems and persons who deliver special educational services could learn from both levels of inquiry.

Our question remained worded in such a way as to imply certain expectations. The word "impact", for example, connotes the largest, most powerful and permanent effects one might attribute to an intervention. By the same token, it also suggests that the "best" conditions for the experiment are a malleable environment but also necessarily one which is, at the same time, largely stable, if impact is to be clear and easily identifiable.

In investigating our question, we had to be at least aware of the possibility that impact might be more than an active assault upon a passive situation. Impact cannot be considered in so limited a way nor judged by this high a standard. To broaden the scope of our question, we first imagined "impact" as a continuum which admits different degrees of effect. Impact less potent than total change might result in "pieces" of an intervention remaining either completely intact or only slightly modified at a site. At the weakest end of the impact continuum one is faced with defining a point which illuminates our question better, "What would qualify for a case of null impact?" Identifying null impact accurately would seem to require a picture of preintervention conditions; in the case of Follow Through, this would mean a picture of the school system in which Follow Through was to be placed.

Examining further our original question, the use of the term "Follow Through" carries the implication of a unitary product. But we know Follow Through is composed of different models of education, so that even theoretically it is not unitary. Further, we might ask to what extent are models themselves internally consistent, either from site to site, at a given moment in time in any one classroom or historically comparing the model at two or more points in time. At the same level, each model wishes to present itself as a recognizable product reproducible by a trained person. One's toleration for these claims rests on how extensively one expects consistency in articulation and implementation among the staff members of each sponsor and then teachers to whom they communicate the model in the field. A good dose of classroom experience gives one ample evidence that even highly structured

materials can be treated quite differently by different teachers. In addition, most models have undergone major and minor revisions such that historical and/or internal consistency would be a largely impossible expectation to place on each model. If we cannot rely on each Follow Through teacher in each model in each community to produce a specific set or core of model characteristics then we cannot expect to find impact from either model characteristics or Follow Through teachers. In this case, what should we be looking for? Our answer was that our study would attempt to portray what interactions had taken place between Follow Through and its setting. In this way, we could perhaps determine what qualities of Follow Through might cause effects beyond though not excluding what are believed to be its distinguishing characteristics is the components of each community's model. In other words, we hoped our study might suggest if Follow Through possessed properties beyond the model which might illuminate the relationship between educational innovations and their settings, the school systems.

Our choice of the school system as the realm in which we would try to locate effects rested on two assumptions:

(1) that implicit in Follow Through's existence was the hope that it would eventually be, at the least, financially sponsored--at the most, integrated as well as financially sponsored, by school systems in which it was placed; and

(2) if Follow Through did not effect the system in some ways (which we could not as yet specify) assumption (1) would never become a reality.

In order to anticipate what such a study might look like to get a better feeling for its problems we planned to conduct a pilot study in a New England Follow Through site: Danton, New Hampshire.*

B. A Brief History of Follow Through in _____

Follow Through is a kindergarten through third grade program. In Danton it has always been in only three of eleven schools. The total number of classrooms in the program has remained relatively constant since the beginning. There are now fourteen classes with no more than six Follow Through teachers in any one school. Each of the schools has an average of 30 teachers with additional staff for administration, maintenance and special instruction. Therefore, Follow Through is numerically overwhelmed in both the entire system and in each individual school.

Historically, the program has had a series of four directors, each of whom experienced special battles within Follow Through. The first one had a brief term of a year or so and no one interviewed could really recall the director's name or character. Shortly after this, a former elementary school principal from out of state (itself unusual in this system) took over for a four-year stint. She is remembered fondly by system administrators but is viewed by Follow Through teaching personnel has having difficulty in understanding and fully supporting the model while being a thoroughly efficient administrator. It appears in retrospect that some major battles for Follow Through were fought at that time. When Follow Through came to Danton, the administration assigned teachers to the program and FT staff was excluded from both recruiting and hiring procedures. In retrospect, it is difficult to obtain any information

* The identity of the community we studied has been changed.

about the system's initial criteria for assignment though many sources reported teachers were not asked to volunteer. In approximately its third year, Follow Through administration led and won a full-scale attack on the superintendent, eventually brought before the school committee demanding the right to hire its own teachers.

The present director performed an acting function prior to an interim director and to her own appointment as permanent director. Both Follow Through and system personnel generally accept and respect her, finding her a welcome combination of reasonable administration and intelligent, restrained model advocacy.

About the time the present director was moving into her position a new superintendant had been hired for Danton after a nationwide search. He brought to his new job at least two characteristics which might have been designed to ignite many regular employees of the Danton system: 1) He was black in an environment dominated by Irish and Italians. 2) He advocated some liberal educational ideas (staff development, new programs, national resources, etc.) in a school community which had often been charged with nepotism, inertia and inadequacy. Though his administration was brief, he hired several persons key to making decisions. One such person is the current Assistant Superintendant who numbers among his other responsibilities overseeing the Follow Through program. He and the most recent director appear to share similar views of what should happen to Follow Through and how it can be employed to the advantage of both the system and the program. For example, Danton has progressively absorbed Follow Through's budget.

In order to accomodate some parents' demands for alternative education, additional open classes such as Bank Street's have been made available. These classes are supported by an experienced classroom teacher whose function is identical to the staff development position in Bank Street's model (i.e., combination supervisor, advisor and resource teacher) who is salaried by Follow Through and who is responsible to both the Follow Through director and the systems administrator in charge of elementary education.

C. Selection of A Case Study Method

By necessity, there were only a few basic strategies we could consider for our feasibility study. In the life of an eight-year innovation, any determinations and findings we made could reflect virtually only one moment in time. We see this as the largest defect in our plan.

Other limitations followed. For example, time constraints affected our choice of methods. We assumed it more likely that we might find evidence of slow and small signs of change than of visible events with powerful repercussions which tend to occur at given moments. Moreover, even if the latter did occur, the likelihood that they would do so during our three-month contact with the school system was small. Due to our own time limitation and the frequency and character of most "change", we rejected observation as a strategy. We then considered questionnaires and interviews. But each carries the undersirable flows inherent in self-reporting and memory: exaggeration, the loss of crucial events and the addition of ones which may

never have occurred. However, determining how closely data conform to some unalterable version of reality may not be a significant problem. In interviews respondents usually state what they believe is true though it may not conform to another respondent's version of the same event.

A great many issues we would theoretically classify as impacts are based on beliefs that persons hold about questions such as "Whom is Follow Through for?" "How are teachers treated in the program?" and "Do children learn to read?" Finding a single answer to each of these questions, much less substantiating any is not possible. Reputation, opinion and consensus appear to be the only available criteria for understanding impact. Our contention is that, assuming respondents do believe what they say, the reality we must search for is these perceptions rather than a set of "facts" which are indisputable to a group of participants.

We rejected questionnaires as a method because we thought they had not produced sufficient in-depth explanatory data in past studies that we had reviewed for this work. Our final selection was interviewing. We chose to interview one-to-one and tape record when possible. We chose to look at only one community (and therefore model) rather than several communities. We saw this as a necessary choice between a more profound and therefore generative understanding of issues and problems versus a larger pool of information understood less well in the available time.

The community in which the pilot study was conducted, Danton, has a school system known as a traditional one with a long standing reputation for political and parochial dominance. As we mentioned previously, new admini-

stration over the past four years has helped to begin unbending the schools. We felt that possibly both sets of conditions would be beneficial to our understanding Follow Through's impact in that closed as well as open conditions would be part of the history in our chosen site.

II. THE STORY OF DANTON

A. An Introduction to Danton

We were acquainted with a women who had formerly been associated with Follow Through administration in Danton. We interviewed her before others to give us an overview of the program from her experience with it. We asked her to describe the program in its early days: to mention specific events which were memorable, successes and failures. This interview further reinforced our notion that impact on the school system was an important focus for the pilot study. It seemed apparent that if adjustments were not made by the system or Follow Through, that FT influence and impact would be diminished accordingly. In other words, we held the hypothesis that there could be no program impact without some aspect of interaction with the system.

The author has done previous work on the implementation of Head Start (H.S. models. Each of these has a Follow Through counterpart and model descriptions for each program are largely identical within model. The Head Start work on implementation was a clear example of the problem of most innovations: Head Start models were learned, transmitted and/or translated by teachers to children. Only an innovation which exclusively used programmed materials could be said to deliver services directly to children and thereby warrant an investment in examining whether children in fact learned something from a program. Most Head Start and Follow Through models do not have programmed materials and some do not even specify many materials. Therefore most models are the teachers who are transferring the model. In fact, most models' components talk about the quality of teaching and learning activities and not specific activities. Therefore, the impor-

tance of the chain of communication through which a model's "message" is passed becomes increasingly important the more its components emphasize values and principles over programmed activities and concrete instructions. Filtering what the model is about through the fewest persons in Bank Street, 1) the sponsor expresses her conception of the model to persons employed by the model to work with different FT communities. 2) These persons go to communities and "teach" the model to community Staff Developers. 3) Staff Developers in turn work weekly with teacher. These teachers expose their children to the model. As in the traditional circle game where the first person whispers a word to the second, the word the last person hears and then speaks is never identical to the first word. Danton 's model, Bank Street,* probably has a high potential for "suffering in translation" as do many models. Obviously "Bank Street" is simply the easiest term to designate the unknown set of educational phenomena our study is about.

Our first informant accompanied us to an initial meeting with the present Follow Through director in Danton. Together they suggested a list of persons in Follow Through and the school system who met the criteria of different responsibilities and points of view. An extension of our notion that we were searching for perceptions about the relationship of Follow Through to the school system was an assumption that persons in different roles might have different perceptions. In addition, we thought it desirable to talk with persons who were both "for" and "against" Follow Through.

At this point, we would like to acknowledge fully how crucial is the choice of respondents to both the quantity and quality of the data. If the

---

* A description of this model in the form of a checklist of items can be found in the appendix.

researcher forfeits or must forfeit control of this issue, it is important to document the steps in that process. Our initial list of respondents was revised by the Director of FT as she felt on consideration that it was preferable to involve personnel at every FT school. We have no reason to believe our data suffered from that modification. The Assistant Superintendent whose authorization for the study was required sought a rationale for the number of respondents (though he approved the list) and asked that he receive a copy of the report. Both the request of the director and the Assistant Superintendent are reasonable. We record them here to indicate the possible complications of access to informants which, of course, could easily extend to building principals and other persons within the system. Plainly, in theory, the resulting restraints on the quality of data can be many.

Our final list of potential respondents totalled approximately seventeen. It was composed of both Follow Through and non-Follow Through administrators, teachers and assistants who had had some contact with the program. The respondents first received a letter from the Assistant Superintendent describing our study and asking for the cooperation of staff. Huron followed one or two weeks later with telephone calls requesting interview appointments. At this time we again made a point of explaining the purpose of our study. Nonetheless it remained confusing to some, and we felt that this surrounded some interviews with a mist of "hidden agendas". In addition, the usual reassurances of confidentiality were weakened (especially for regular school staff)

by what we later discovered to be both major hostility and resentment as well as minor irritation between Follow Through and regular school staff.

While many respondents appeared not to hide their judgments, we frequently felt interviews were characterized by a lack of openness. Accordingly, we think our data must be considered a small part of the picture of Danton and perhaps even a biased one.

B. The Setting

Our initial meetings with Follow Through and school administration, in which we sought permission to conduct this study were held in Follow Through offices, located in a large trade school. No matter what time of day one's appointments were, very few teenagers were in the halls or in the classrooms. The halls were poorly lighted and quite empty. Follow Through offices occupied a second story isolated corner of this building while system administrative offices were housed at another distant second floor corner. Directional signs to these offices were either few or nonexistent. One had to know one's way around or ask a great many questions to arrive at the proper place.

Our next step was to call respondents at their schools seeking interview appointments following the Assistant Superintendent's explanatory memo which introduced our study. Of eleven non-Follow Through personnel contacted, four persons received at least two messages. Two either never returned the call or were otherwise unavailable. With Follow Through personnel one of six received more than one message.

Interviews for the study itself were conducted in all three schools which house the program. All the schools share a quality well-known to observers (and attenders) of public schools in urban areas, namely, difficulty of access. This is illustrated in many ways: official entry doors, usually the only ones that are unlocked, are virtually undistinguished from minor locked side doors. You must "know" the school to distinguish these doors and enter without some delay. In another case a principal's office is unmarked as well as located in an unconventional place in the building. In only one of the schools is there adequate and comfortable space allocated for outside persons waiting to do business with or in the school.

When such various and pervasive access problems preceded some interviews especially of non-Follow Through personnel, it became difficult to credit the subsequent interview material of those respondents as being open or complete and signalled the likelihood of the interviewer making assumptions in favor of Follow Through interviews as a more accurate and complete set of data. The reader must judge for himself if the interviewer was alerted rather than biased by these experiences.

Most interviews tended to run for an hour, sometimes longer. Respondents had been advised in the letter requesting their participation that the interview would run 30-60 minutes but often they asked again on the phone how long the inverview would last. In a few cases interviews ran much longer and/or respondents were asked to give a second interview because of either the comprehensive nature of their role and information (e.g., the Follow Through director) or because of their interest in the study and program and their level of information.

The material which resulted from these interviews frequently seemed confusing--incidents respondents reported as important seemed to have either no effects or unimaginable ones. The interviews were long on judgments, but short on specific recall of supporting evidence.

Given these conditions we looked at our data in two ways. First, we tried to determine what Follow Through's impact on Danton was. This was difficult as for each incident there seemed to be endless hypothetical impacts in terms of both size and quality given each "player's" point of view. Since this proved a confusing initial approach, we attempted to determine whether there were any themes which groups of interviews illustrated irrespective of the affiliation of the respondent. This also served as a way of examining whether the notion of opposing the school system and Follow Through was in fact an important way to consider impact. In other words it might be that phenomena or events joined persons more than predetermined group affiliations. We relied on both processes to give us an idea of the feasibility of obtaining information on Follow Through impact and/or whether impact might be present at all in Danton.

C. Themes in Interviews

All respondents were asked to reminisce about Follow Through and unravel their history with it. Usually they explained their roles in the conventional sense of responsibilities. The interviewer listened for the comparisons they drew with other programs or events. Aspects of each person's role which were mentioned but not considered central by them also were proved for the insights they might bring via association.

It is a problem to extract common threads from these interviews, yet categorizing responses is the heart of this study. Each person's account seems to be qualified by his or her former experience, age, philosophical stance and program role such that larger lessons take on only a dim and uncertain shape. However, we found the following themes in this material which appear suggestive:

(1) isolation;

(2) reputation and reality; and

(3) novelty and tradition.

(1) Isolation

Isolation and separateness were feelings expressed by almost every respondent whether in Follow Through or not, with the exception of the very highest level administrators. It was experienced both personally and professionally, unconsciously and consciously and as either a discouraging, enervating condition of work or one to be expected and accepted uncomplainingly. Follow Through personnel attributed these feelings more quckly to situations created by a new program but also consciously located the difficulties in the system.

In general, Follow Through personnel assumed responsibility for correcting uncomfortable conditions and moreover could be represented as earnestly struggling to free themselves and the program from isolation and misunderstanding. On the other hand, while non-Follow Through personnel experienced isolation, they seemed less conscious of the source and impact. At the same time their interviews often revealed that system practices created isolating

conditions for them. For example, a system administrator voluntarily developed a scheme for evaluating a program under her jurisdiction. The evaluation is not required by the system, but it produced interesting results. Since there is no established channel for its presentation as there is no official staff time with peers or superiors where ongoing work is discussed. This administrator's associates know she carries on this evaluation work, but nothing at all about the details. She characterizes her peers as viewing it as her "little bit of silliness" about which they make jokes. This self-generated work appears to have a price of isolation because of two unusual characteristics: it is voluntary and it involves direct work with children. The first is somewhat unusual at any level in the system; the second atypical administrative behavior. In this light, the status of her work within the total system becomes that of a hobby and possibly borders on an illegitimate activity.

Two Follow Through employees in differing roles also talked about isolation, but more clearly identified it with their Follow Through commitments. They saw themselves as engaged in a process of "being accepted" by their school's regular staff. One has worked in Follow Through virtually its entire lifetime in Danton, the other for only a few years. Each identified himself as an "outsider" in relation to the school system, a status which seems to carry both benefits and drawbacks. It means one can't be controlled, one shouldn't be contacted (i.e., talked to, relied on for help, trusted, etc.) and remarkably, that one was not born, raised and presently living in Danton. Each of these persons has a different expectation of the

ultimate outcome of his or her present feelings. One equates his present state of "acceptance" with learning how to "handle the system". He also expressed that certain problems which formerly absorbed a great deal of his energy (mainly the level of anti-Follow Through hostility within his school) have disappeared.

The other Follow Through staff member's feelings are unresolved but he sees that progress has been made in "establishing a reputation". He used this phrase as synonymous with a process of acceptance. In accomplishing this, he saw previous work he had done with Follow Through as a step in his full-time employment. He also felt living in Danton fostered others' acceptance of him.

By the report of both Follow Through and non-Follow Through respondents, isolation occurred for groups of Follow Through teachers within schools. Several respondents cited repeated incidents where in the program's earliest year "regular" teachers within the schools would not speak to Follow Through teachers. Conversations in one school's teachers room would stop when a Follow Through teacher entered. In another school, Follow Through teachers were given a separate area in which to eat their lunch. The area was located in the boiler room. Until 1974, Follow Through teachers apparently were not included in general meetings of "regular"* system elementary teachers and in this way were treated as distinct and separate as were special programs,

---

* It is important to recognize here that the term "regular" teachers refers to all teachers and programs which are undifferentiated by special funding. That is, the largest and most dominant group is the one that is the most undistinguished by any special characteristics.

which already existed in the school structure, such as the bilingual and learning disabilities program.

However, the Follow Through program in Danton also has a history, which continues to the present, of decisions and actions by which they intentionally isolate themselves. For example, FT apparently has never used any test used by the school system. They have always held independent all Follow Through staff meetings across schools and in the past few years have instituted within-building meetings for Follow Through staff.

Though one can theoretically distinguish a line between an isolation that is destructive and a separateness that could guarantee program development and integrity, the Follow Through program in Danton cannot be placed on either side of that line. One would say that both the system and FT share an ambiguity about the necessity and usefulness of isolation.

(2) Reputation and reality

The reputation of the Follow Through program is superficially similar across both Follow Through and non-Follow Through respondents. In general, both groups represent Follow Through as (1) a program for children some of whom can be described as deprived and sometimes even difficult; and (2) giving preference to areas which are not traditional academic ones. Needless to say, attitudes towards these two points vary. Follow Through employees all agree that deprived children are interesting and bright and they aren't "difficult" if you treat them right and respect the fact that they may have different learning patterns (point 2) which may require offering other than standard academic fare. The model believes any child should experience a variety of materials and content such that cognitive

social and emotional areas are all addressed by a broad array of examples. The largest group of non-Follow Through respondents shared (or at least are willing to tolerate) the general views of the model. On the other hand, the remaining regular system personnel we interviewed were frankly opposed to Follow Through. In some cases they continued to label Follow Through children as "poor-and-difficult" and equate that with "hopeless-and-unchangeable". At the same time some system administrators spoke derisively of the program, insisting that children only played, that academic performance was inadequate, recording of progress meaningless and heavily implied that meaningful achievement was non-existent. These respondents usually offered opinions and judgments but could not give much detailed supporting evidence even when asked.

Only one non-Follow Through staff member produced what may have been any "hard" information. She too was concerned about lack of achievement in Follow Through children compared with the better achievement of children in regular classes. She stated that she was reluctant to share her information with anyone in either Follow Through or the school system. She cited two reasons for keeping this information from the system: the first was that it would confirm negative feeling about the Follow Through program and second, a former superintendent had not made public some achievement scores which showed Follow Through children functioning at a lower level than others. In explaining her reasons for keeping the information from the FT director she cited a history of battles with them over the appropriate measures for testing

---

* This approach would be a clear implication of the model view toward reading.

certain abilities. Therefore, her test choices would render her information useless to Follow Through by their criteria. However, she later discussed her information with her director who requested a memo summarizing her findings sent to the Assistant Superintendent in charge of Follow Through with a copy to the Director of Follow Through. Neither has spoken with her about this work or acknowledged receipt of the memo in over four months.

Our informant, the former Follow Through administrator, had told us many stories of the early days of the program when, for example, obtaining needed services from the system for children whose performance and/or abilities were poor was virtually impossible. This encouraged a bias with which the first waves of Follow Through staff entered their jobs: that Follow Through cared more about children and therefore would and could do more for them. Our informant points out that there has been no long term follow-up of families who received a great deal of attention and time from Follow Through. In a sense, the zeal and good will which Follow Through fostered may have made it difficult for this service program to critically examine its results.

At any rate, our interviews suggest that reputation, beliefs and intentions about the program by either Follow Through or system employees appear to travel farther and remain stronger while the search for specific and concrete information is at best weak. This indicates that innovations may more frequently act as a focus for polarizing issues than serve as vehicles for testing particular ideas.

(3) Novelty and tradition

Follow Through was characterized as an "innovation". This implies that it would be entirely new to its settings. In fact, innovations often bring some familiar program aspects with them. It is more practical, we

think, to discount the implications of the characterization and to approach an innovation fully recognizing the distinction between what might be actually new and what might be familiar to a given school system. In this way, one could achieve a clearer perspective about how much the innovation might offer to, conflict with, or change a setting.

The national Follow Through program was conceived as a series of classroom curriculum innovations. The particular model which Danton chose specified many more teacher and child behaviors than it did materials, which already was at some variance with stated national program intentions. The individual specifications of Danton's model covered ways to do things in the classroom rather than a detailed list of what to do.

In the Danton system, distinctions of status, pay, rank, etc., are underscored in many ways. The model's specifications imply that it is indifferent to who is cast as the teacher and who the learner--expecting a direction, generation of ideas, production and reception to take place at and between all persons in schools. These, of course, are innovative ideas to a system which is authoritarian and gives serious consideration most frequently to the ideas of those persons beyond him in the hierarchy.

On the other hand, Danton's model stressed some values familiar to the school system--for example, staff communcation. However, the conditions of meetings called for by the model were unfamiliar to Danton; their frequency and the often large numbers of persons participating often required rooms than simply corridors to be made available in schools. This was a problem at the inception of Follow Through, and it still continues since many meetings still occur in school basements.

D. What Was the Impact of Follow Through on the School System in the Pilot Community?

Our study found three general answers to this question: Follow Through had some impact on the school system; the system had some impact on Follow Through; and, finally, there were incidents which we cannot fully attribute to either and which appear to be created by a reciprocal relationship between the system and Follow Through. Specifically, these impacts on the system have been the following.

When Follow Through has impact on the system, the model as it is described is not the only source of effects.

There are features of the model either obscured or unstated which are as likely if not more likely to affect the school system as are the stated model components. Bank Street has relatively low interest in standard academic achievement, a fact implied by the number of components which emphasize social and emotional learning and few which stress the importance of traditional academic subjects. This year, the achievement of Danton Follow Through children in one particular academic area is negligible when compared with the achievement of non-Follow Through children. What impact this has had or will have is difficult to say. We do not know to what extent the system is concerned over the level of academic achievement in either Follow Through or regular classes at present. If low academic achievement on the part of any child is taken seriously by the system it might, nonetheless,

minimize its concerns in the case of Follow Through, if Follow Through is seen as offering something valuable at another level. For example, the system might view it as a political or educational feather to sponsor a "special" national program or have access to additional resources.

A second example of implicit characteristics which have impact is the style of Danton's model. Though style is not specified, components imply that the model prefers demonstration and persuasion as major techniques of communication. Parallels can be drawn between Bank Street's description of the teacher's role in presenting ideas to the child (indirect, offering of experience, supportive) and Follow Through staff presenting ideas to the system. One Follow Through employee saw herself as encouraging the principal of a school to sponsor more open classes at a specific grade level. We asked this respondent to describe more exactly how she had proceeded. She replied that she frequently dropped into his office to "chat" about open classes she'd observed, the progress of a teacher's work, etc. She reported that although she'd invested a great deal of time in convincing the principal to support more open classes, he had never established such classes much to her surprise and dismay.

This principal's interviews show that he clearly questions the benefits of open classes. He is openly skeptical toward the model's definition of work (e.g., "playing with frogs"), style of reporting (anecdotal), amount of classroom noise and the reputed low academic performance of its children. However, we think it is also possible that the principal reacts equally negatively to a strategy of persuasion and is unresponsive to the non-traditional interchange of receiving suggestions from an employee of lower rank. These methods may have allowed the principal's response (and ultimate refusal) to remain hidden for some time. In the framework of the system, where

directives are the preferred method of communication, indirectness, persuasion, and discussion are characteristics of a foreign culture. Overall, a view of colleaguial relationships as providing educationally exciting and generative possibilities is an absent concept. In Danton, we think Bank Street's strategies may have been read by system personnel as allowing "delays" or as statements that the model would never act without the unanimous agreement of the system. Only when the Danton system's highest administrators changed and a new administration valued the program did steps to integrate and expand Follow Through occur.

This is only one example of how impact can be a function of implicit model characteristics. This leads us to believe that all models can and may serve as a kind of generative analogue to Follow Through staff and that it is the character of the setting that determines which components or which implications of them must be utilized. In this way, implicit model components may be stronger than explicit ones. This hypothesis is entirely in line with earlier work we have done which demonstrates that each model's components, no matter what their degree of specificity, raise many questions for the practitioner. Not only does this prevent most models from realizing a uniform product from site to site and classroom to classroom, but it also involves many sponsors in a dialogue in which sites seek specifications to cover all conditions each component addresses (e.g., what happens if the child already

knows page 10 in his book, but not page 9?)and specifications for areas not covered in the model description (e.g., what do the academic models want children to do at playtime?).

To view impact as only emanating directly from specific components is probably too narrow a scope for a national study of FT. Not only does such a study require consideration of implied specifications, but also an effort to construct what the model stood for in the context of the particular site and what was emphasized in the relationship between it and the setting.

Follow Through has broadened the experience of regular teachers and children as to what material is appropriately expressed in school.

FT staff with longest employment in the Danton system all insist that regular teachers showed "loosening up" during FT. Teachers' rooms look more individual whereas formerly "...the flag, maps and pencils" seemed to have had the same place in every room. After FT arrived, teachers painted their rooms, put up more pictures and generally made classrooms more inviting though FT teachers were often ridiculed for these same behaviors early in the program.

The quality of relationships between FT and non-FT staff appears to have undergone changes as have relationships between non-Follow Through teachers and their children. One FT teacher ascribes this to the children. She said that she encouraged children in her class to hug and kiss one another, to tussle in a friendly way with adults, and generally to express physical affection. She cited an example of a teacher who had reportedly strongly disliked FT children. This teacher became a within-school

specialist and in that capacity was forced to have contact with Follow Through children. They held her hands, put their arms around her and generally melted her objections to the vanishing point. In fact, according to the Follow Through teacher, the specialist was stunned as well as won over.

Another respondent noted that traditionally teachers in the system received few visitors. She saw teachers as generally fearful of visitors, because they required contact and explanations. Children were to act or speak at these times (as at others) only with teacher authorization. This changed over the course of Follow Through and teachers were increasingly welcoming visitors and children often took the responsibility of integrating strangers into the classroom.

Several Follow Through teachers observed that regular teachers in one school commonly believed that all children from the same family were troublesome if one older child from the family had a record of school disruption. The Follow Through teachers reported that now children from the same family are seen more frequently as individuals. Also, the same child who may have difficulty one year has a better chance of being perceived as having the possibility of improving the next year. "Trouble" is no longer an immutable quality of the child, but one which may be more often viewed by regular staff as located in the environment or as an interaction between it and the child.

The personal background and values and educational and professional training of Follow Through staff are frequently different from those of regular system staff.

Danton appears to be a particularly extreme case of regular employees of the system historically meeting informal but nontheless stringent qualifications of entry. Two of three building administrators we interviewed had been born and raised in Danton, had attended Danton public schools, and were primarily from one ethnic group. One administrator had attended the school of which he is now the principal. Though no one would quote a definite figure, the percentage of teachers who met the "born and raised" criteria was conservatively estimated by one system administrator as "probably not as high as 50%" whereas other guesses placed it at 75%. Even without a history that is suggestive of politics, nepotism and xenophobia dominating hiring within the system in the past, it is our guess that overall the background variables of Follow Through staff in Danton differ from the majority of tenured regular staff though there was no source of conclusive information on either group. One FT employee had a history of working with poverty programs; another had worked with runaway children before teaching, a third at a community center. The few persons we interviewed at the administrative level at FT had graduated from well known liberal colleges and had advanced degrees from well recognized schools of eductaion. Some had had in depth experience with innovations, sometimes in projects that sought teacher change. Others had a background in psychology or special education programs both of which focus on individualization as a major operating principle. Viewing children as individuals

is consonant with the models' position, but of course, is at variance with traditional education which most frequently treats children as members of a large group.

FT staff's view of their roles and work frequently had a missionary cast. Two very different FT employees talked about their view of the system and the system's view of them. One, a teacher, talked about the qualities she had which made her visibly different.

-- She wore her hair in a way no one else did.

-- She dressed differently from other teachers.

-- Children called her by her first name.

-- She took her children out of the building more frequently on trips.

She claimed that these characteristics had prevented her from obtaining an application form to teach in Follow Through from an earlier system administrator who found her characteristics intolerable. Though we might say that this particular teacher had a need to be noticed, and/or to engage in conflict with authority, we also can't imagine her finding the Banton system tolerable without a program such as FT being available, even though she experienced difficulty in gaining entry to it. It could be viewed as a protection and support for some of the views this teacher held. Later, when she was finally employed by FT, she entered into head-on disagreements with regular school staff who disliked FT, and now feels there is mutual respect and help between FT and non-FT staff within her school's faculty.

A former FT administrator spoke of her work as a conscious effort at "cross-fertilizing with the school system" and going to battle with it, at some level, on almost every issue. This administrator had a doctorate in psychology from a prestigious eastern university. The administrator

with whom she had the most contact, though employed by FT had been a public school administrator for many years. It is difficult to imagine many other work settings that would bring two such people together as collaborators. What might this mean? One of our interpretations is that only an ambitious new and somewhat idealistic program like Follow Through could attract persons with alternative ideas about education in wide numbers to a system as closed as Danton's.

In Danton, the minimum as well as maximum effect of all three of Follow Through's impacts on the system can be expressed in two ways. 1) Follow Through modeled an alternative set of procedures, practices, decisions, relationships and values, and 2) the usual aspects of the school culture in the above areas were played out by a selectively different set of actors. These impacts, of course, are not as distinct as we have made them here; indeed, in our judgment, both could occur simultaneously. Regardless of the specific impact of any event or events, the enactment of an option, the newness of a program insofar as it is observed and experienced by "setting regulars", is a desirable outcome for any innovation.

E. The Bigger Half: The System Has Impact on Follow Through

Searching for the impact of Follow Through, we received many accounts from Follow Through respondents of the trials of model implementation or of personal and professional assumptions operating in the system which were either non-supportive or destructive to the model. We found that the setting often created more important and dominant circumstances than did the innovation. Our picture of Danton contains two categories of events: (1) events which arise from two very different groups meeting as equals and (2) events which occur when the practices and procedures developed over time by the system cannot accomodate demands of the innovation. Given the framework of the public school system, Follow Through was asked to function in a setting with ongoing organizational life, many rules and a long history. The result was that the setting had at least as much impact on Follow Through as Follow Through had on the setting.

(1) The system defines conditions of work.

In all models' specifications were embedded conditions of work which were either second nature to some sponsors or in the case of other sponsors, unknown. Bank Street believed, as did many model sponsors, that if the community were forewarned by a description of their Follow Through curriculum, then cooperation, acceptance and implementation would occur. However, to our knowledge no model adequately anticipated the deep effects that differences in assumptions and procedures would have on the conditions of work for Follow Through employees. Both the morale of Follow Through employees and implemen-

tation of the model have been and still are affected as a result of these differences.

For example, in one description of the Bank Street model, the following component appears:

> Symbolic representations of direct experience, especially in the form of language, receive a great deal of emphasis (stories, experience charts, and/or paintings about trips, block buildings with labels such as 'Tim's building, do not knock down', or 'Empire State Building', dramatic play, discussions, books, writing or telling stories to learn about a pet, the aquarium, growing plants, etc.) *

The potential for differences between the model and the system in this one item are many. The first of two concrete examples we can cite from interviews has to do with the meaning of "experiences" and how children get them (which they must do in order to write about them in "experience charts"). "Experiences" often involve going outside of school, and more frequently than the two bus trips a year which most classes are offered. In Danton, more than two class trips was seen as unusual by regular staff for two reasons: (1) it was unprecedented, and, (2) Follow Through had greater resources at its disposal which made some teachers angry and/or envious. Providing "experiences" frequently placed Follow Through in a defensive position.

A second difference between Follow Through and the system can arise from the implementation of a curriculum suggestion like block building. In the

---

*This is taken from a description of the model called essential components which was produced by Bank Street for a follow-up study of Head Start Planned Variation conducted by The Huron Institute in 1974, which can be found in Appendix B.

Bank Street program, buildings are often used by children for days without being dismantled. This interferes with the routine of custodial services in a building as does the painting, clay, or many other "messy" activities endorsed by the program. This can become an issue which members of the system object to in ways which temporarily thwart or even crush the implementation of a model and through which they can also restrict a range of related model tenets.

Information about the behavior of principals during the initial years of Follow Through is sparse. Reports of present school operations by Follow Through and regular teachers characterize principals as frequently irrelevant to the course or conclusion of various events. The reports of Follow Through staff sometimes cite the principal's negativism toward the FT program. This suggests leadership at the school level may have played no role in the early days of FT, or at most functioned as a clandestine support to negativism on the part of Follow Through staff. We might also surmise that it was "business as usual". Whatever our interpretation, each leads to a view of Danton's system as exhibiting behaviors on a narrow band of hostility to indifference which Follow Through had to endure as best it could so long as power--either by virtue of numbers or position--naturally favored the system's tendency to inertia and isolation. It is only the more recent changeover in high level administration which shifted the balance, allowing Follow Through to function in a more unimpeded way.

(2) As the system increases support and integration of Follow Through it also dilutes Follow Through.

Since the effects of the incorporation of a smaller enterprise by a larger one frequently results in the dilution of the smaller, it should come as no surprise that currently FT appears to be following this route. The reasons for an increase of support and integration are almost entirely due to a new influx of high-level administrators who wish to promote open classrooms as an example of alternative education. System administration also sees a need to integrate classes within schools so that none is a "discrete appendage." The model has a percentage of its budget allocated to outreach -- i.e., FT related services. This has been used to hire another "staff developer" to work with seven teachers in the system interested in establishing open classes. Though this employee's approach is like the models -- she was formerly employed in a similar position by another FT model (EDC) whose views are close to but not identical with Danton's model -- she has no training workshop supervision, etc. by any representative of the model and though she theoretically feels a vague obligation to it, clearly does not and cannot proselytize for Bank Street.

It is difficult to imagine a situation in which program extension through adoption by a parent organization would not involve dilution. With joint funding or funding by the parent body, control and influence are sacrificed over time with the turnover of personnel. The stance of former administrators in Follow Through was to focus on the model, struggle to be clear about its details of implementation and forward its cause with missionary zeal.

Both Follow Through and system administration talk very globally about the model and the program and all seem to share the feeling that it is a vehicle for forwarding a few very general concepts such as open classes. This suggests that an innovation period of highest return may be relatively brief when its central actors are energetic and cause-oriented. During this time the innovation may be a catalyst, giving the system "something to think about".

III. DISCUSSION OF CONCLUSIONS

There are a number of questions embedded in our original consideration of whether it is feasible to conduct a national study of the impact of the Follow Through program. It is clear to us from the pilot that if feasibility means "can it be done?", the answer is yes. A more meaningful cast to the question is to ask "should it be done?"

The pilot indicates that impact is a judgment relative to (1) the state of the setting prior to the innovation, and (2) the character of the subsequent relationship between the innovation and the setting. A national study which was based on an interpretation of impact as an interactive phenomena could offer interesting results to policy makers as well as model sponsors and school systems.

We see a national study as having two purposes:

(1) to explore and articulate the range of assumptions held by each partner in Follow Through system/model pairs, i.e., pre-innovation descriptors of these two groups;

(2) to begin to establish a universe of partnership characteristics which evolves from these pairs, i.e., the results of the interactions of the above descriptors.

Such a study would hopefully lead to some ability to diagnose whether were any regular relationships between the extent and kind of site-innovation differences and the impact of the site and innovation on each others. For example, political considerations are strong determinants of the location

of educational innovations. It is tolerable for policy to have this degree of latitude in part because there is little information to help make placement more precise. We think Follow Through might help provide some more definition to such questions as, "Should sites and innovations be minimally or maximally different to reach X result?" Policy would not be the only beneficiary. Sponsors have already instinctively refined their pre-Follow Through notions of a contractual relationship with a distant community. Some sponsors have learned by virtue of their Follow Through experience that they must secure the committed support of principals for their program prior to considering a contractual agreement. Others have discovered that problems of first year teachers, isolated rural areas or systemw with projecting low funding levels are not the areas their model can productively address.

The areas in which we see it as valuable to gather information from both the system and the innovation to help define their similarities and differences fall in these categories:

1. Hiring qualifications. What are the hiring procedures? What are the criteria for hiring? How are they applied? How are education, former experience, residence, age and affiliations handled?

2. Job Definition:

   a. What are the sources of job definition (for example, authority, the self, a mutual process between the two). Is the job viewed as having limits? If so, are they based on pay, contract limitations, "dedication", etc.?

b. What is the scope of the job? What groups does it address? (children, parents, colleagues, etc.) Is it limited to academic concerns or does it encompass social-emotional areas? politics?

3. Model of Learning for Children and Adults: Is interest in learning a desirable attribute? From whom does one learn? In what settings? Under what kinds of conditions?

4. Model of Decision-Making: At what levels in the organization are problems identified? Are they communicated? If so, to whom? Is problem solving a priority? Where does it occur? About what kinds of issues? What sorts of issues fail to be addressed either due to lack of attention or conscious choice? Who has access to knowledge about the decision-making process?

Our hypothesis is that the catalytic function of an innovation is its most pervasive feature. We see it as possibly both a minimum as well as maximum effect. If only a small part of the accusations leveled at public school systems are accurate, there is a general need to introduce catalysts such as Follow Through periodically. Their sheer existence as well as their degree of novelty may precipitate a review of system assumptions around such issues as hiring, tracking, tenure, curriculum priorities, etc. These catalysts could be introduced with a full intention to withdraw them at a specific time. This strategy and purpose are useful as review and change do not seem to be easily generated internally and because indefinitely prolonged

interventions may take on the characteristics of systems and lose their catalytic function. Learning more about the character of system innovation relationships would assist in predicting the use of particular innovations in particular sites to maximize the productive use of short term educational programs.

Appendix A

Bank Street Checklist

BANK STREET (February Revision)
MODEL IMPLEMENTATION CHECKLIST: 1971-1972

KEY 1=Specification not at all implemented
2=Specification implemented to some extent
3=Specification implemented to a great extent
4=Fully implemented
5=Beyond technical implementation
X=No opportunity to observe

I. LEARNING-TEACHING BEHAVIOR

A. Children's Behavior

1.	Children move freely but purposefully among many interest areas.	1 2 3 4 X
2.	Children demonstrate active participation in their own learning through self-initiated expression and through seeking more understanding of facts, ideas and processes.	1 2 3 4 X
3.	Children make choices among activities and are able to act upon them.	1 2 3 4 X
4.	Children select materials that are appropriate to the activity.	1 2 3 4 X
5.	Children appear to find their activities satisfying.	1 2 3 4 X
6.	Children show persistence in pursuing a given task.	1 2 3 4 X
7.	Children generally observe agreed upon limits to their behavior.	1 2 3 4 X
8.	Children carry through steps in working with materials, i.e.: taking out, using and putting them away in designated locations.	1 2 3 4 X

9. Children show some degree of understanding of the identity, characteristics, function, category and relationships of objects and persons. 1 2 3 4 X

10. Children show interest in probing, discovering, experimenting and analyzing the outcome of their experimentation. 1 2 3 4 X

11. Children organize their ideas, reason, plan and solve problems. 1 2 3 4 X

12. Children exercise the freedom to express feelings, spontaneously. 1 2 3 4 X

B. Adult Behavior

*1. The adult is supportive of exploration and questioning. _ 1 2 3 4 5 X
a _____
b _____

2. The adult provides opportunities for skill development. _ 1 2 3 4 5 X
a _____
b _____

3. The adult stimulates and encourages creativity. _ 1 2 3 4 5 X
a _____
b _____

4. The adult challenges and supports problem solving and coping behavior. _ 1 2 3 4 5 X
a _____
b _____

5. The adult shows respect for children's ideas and helps them clarify and extend their thinking. _ 1 2 3 4 5 X
a _____
b _____

6. Adults show concern for rights and feelings of children. _ 1 2 3 4 5 X
a _____
b _____

7. The adults help children to evaluate their own behavior and its consequences for themselves and others. _ 1 2 3 4 5 X
a _____
b _____

*This item may require interview rather than observation alone.

8.	The adults plan limits with the children - limits which are rational, understood, and acceptable.	_ a b	1 2 3 4 5 X
9.	Inappropriate behavior is not dealt with by censure but is redirected.	_ a b	1 2 3 4 5 X
*10.	The adults take into account each child's interests, strenths, weaknesses, and learning styles in developing individualized curriculum.	_ a b	1 2 3 4 5 X
11.	The adults encourage children to work cooperatively and to interact in many ways with one another.	_ a b	1 2 3 4 5 X
12.	Adults encourage children to describe out-of-school experiences, and show interest in the child's whole life.	_ a b	1 2 3 4 5 X
13.	Adults expect and acknowledge task completion when the task is appropriate to the child's age and capacity.	_ a b	1 2 3 4 5 X
14.	Adults record and place displays of children's language and art work prominently and with respect.	_ a b	1 2 3 4 5 X
15.	The adult places displays at child's eye level.	_ a b	1 2 3 4 5 X
16.	Adults change displays frequently to reflect children's changing interests.	_ a b	1 2 3 4 5 X
17.	Each adult provides a role model with which the children may make positive identification.	_ a b	1 2 3 4 5 X

*See page 2.

18. The staff helps to create an open relaxed, active atmosphere in class. _ 1 2 3 4 5 X
a _____
b _____

19. Adults encourage children to plan their own work without adult interference but become involved in their activities as needed. _ 1 2 3 4 5 X
a _____
b _____

20. Adults provide opportunities for child-to-child interaction. _ 1 2 3 4 5 X
a _____
b _____

C. Interaction in Classroom - (Use Key on first page) (Child-adult, child-child, adult-adult)

1. Children appear to trust adults. 1 2 3 4 X

2. Children interact, cooperate and share ideas and material with other children. 1 2 3 4 X

3. A teacher and two assistants share the operational responsibilities of the classroom equally. 1 2 3 4 5 X

3a. The diagnosis and prescriptive responsibilities are primarily responsibilities of the teacher. 1 2 3 4 5 X

4. Suggestions from the assistants are sought by the teacher and there is joint planning of each day's activities. 1 2 3 4 5 X

*5. There is continuing interaction, sharing of information and insights, and mutuality of goals between teaching staff and ancillary staff (such as nurses, family workers and guidance personnel) with the latter observing and sometimes participating. 1 2 3 4 5 X

*See page 2.

*6.	Parents interact with children and adults in terms of children's learning, as the parents participate in the classroom and on trips.	1 2 3 4 X
*7.	There is one-to-one conferencing between parents and teachers concerning the learning needs of individual children. (Interaction with other local staff and the community is described under the section on sponsor's delivery system.)	1 2 3 4 X

II. LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

A. Organizational

1.	The schedule includes work and play periods, both indoors and outdoors, naps, snacks, and luncheons, which are all treated as active learning periods.	1 2 3 4 X
2.	Field trips occur once or twice a week, usually within the school or the neighborhood.	1 2 3 4 X
3.	Children's groupings are flexible so as to provide maximum opportunity for choice and mobility, with the exception of a few formal, structured groups, such as meeting time (or circle time) and transition time. Meeting time may be for the whole group or a small group.	1 2 3 4 X
4.	Most activities, whether formal or informal, are carried out in small groups or individually.	1 2 3 4 X

*See page 2.

5. Teachers and aides move from group to group during the day as needed. 1 2 3 4 5 X

6. Lunch is served family style, i.e., in small groups, with the children serving themselves. 1 2 3 4 X

6a. During lunch, adults stress child-child and child-adult conversation. a 1 2 3 4 5 X
b

B. Physical

1. The classroom is structured and ordered to provide defined areas within which children work and play with materials appropriate for each interest center. 1 2 3 4 X

2. Materials are located so that children know where they are and can reach them readily. 1 2 3 4 X

3. Materials and equipment are planned, rotated, replenished and changed as the need arises. 1 2 3 4 X

4. There is emphasis upon use of natural materials within the child's own environment, and child-made, teacher-made and parent-made materials and equipment, as well as commercial items.

5. Materials are appropriate to the age level, such as including large blocks for motor activity and water, sand and clay for sensory activities. 1 2 3 4 X

6. The interest areas are separated from the main activity of traffic. 1 2 3 4 X

7. There is a protected area with a minimum of interruption for a child or group desiring to engage in a quiet activity. 1 2 3 4 X

8. There is private space for each child's own things. 1 2 3 4 X

9. Adequate storage space is available and storage equipment is often used as room dividers. 1 2 3 4 X

C. Social-Emotional

1. Children convey a sense of joy as they work in the room. 1 2 3 4 X

2. There is awareness of children's feelings, in a way of the primary causes for doing or not doing things with one another. 1 2 3 4 X

3. Adults express their own feelings, in a way that is natural but also geared to children's understanding. 1 2 3 4 5 X
   a _____
   b _____

4. Most children show sympathy for other children when they are in trouble, rather than ridicule or teasing. 1 2 3 4 X

5. Most children show friendliness and warmth toward other children. 1 2 3 4 X

6. Most children seem relaxed and comfortable instead of tense, suspicious or fearful. 1 2 3 4 X

7. Children express feelings of approval or disapproval openly, naturally in a milieu of acceptance. 1 2 3 4 X

8. Children's efforts at inner control and mastery of their own world are recognized and encouraged. 1 2 3 4 X

III. CURRICULUM

A. Basic Principles Undergirding Specific Activities*

		1	2	3	4	5	X
1.	Curriculum is differentiated and particularized, i.e., it reflects the individual goals, interests and needs of children.						
2.	Curriculum is structured according to basic educational principles but is completely flexible in response to the developmental stages of the children, their evolving competencies, and opportunities for learning as they arise in each situation.						
3.	Curriculum moves from the concrete to the conceptual, through first-hand experiences the meaning of which is clarified for and with the children.						
4.	The curriculum is based upon the adult's study of how each child organizes and reinterprets his experience through "play" and his own choice of activities.						
5.	Curriculum is relevant to life styles of families and community.						
6.	The curriculum reinforces and extends the adult's supportive interaction with children aimed to develop positive feelings about self.						
7.	Curriculum planning is a team operation with the teacher primarily responsible and accountable for its effectiveness but drawing upon the knowledge and insights of both paraprofessionals and ancillary staff.						

*This whole category may require interview rather than observation alone.

8. Curriculum is directed toward cognitive and affective growth in constant interaction. 1 2 3 4 5 X

9. Curriculum provides for motor and sensory experiences for independent investigation for problem-solving and for the development of concepts such as sequential ordering, symbolic representation, categorizing, spatial and time relationships, identifying characteristics, functions, and a wide variety of relationships among objects and persons. (The results of these curriculum emphases are delineated under the sections on Child Behavior I, 17. 1 2 3 4 5 X

10. The activities and materials are centered around various themes such as: home (cooking, household chores); environmental studies (rocks, soil, plants, etc.); creative expression (blocks, dramatic play, music, art, etc.). 1 2 3 4 5 X

B. Language

1. Language, both written and spoken, surrounds the child throughout work and play periods. 1 2 3 4 5 X

2. Language activities include stories read to and by children, experiences dictated and illustrated by children, experience charts, name cards, labelling and frequent free discussion periods. 1 2 3 4 5 X

3. Resources for such activities are drawn from books, pictures, films, and various 1 2 3 4 5 X

other media as well as the children's own experiences at home, in school and in organized field trips.

4. Language is learned as a useful pleasurable tool. 1 2 3 4 5 X

5. The curriculum develops not only basic skills but also competencies at a higher level including the creative use of language in self-expression. 1 2 3 4 5 X

6. A wide variety of commercial materials are creatively adapted to the Bank Street Approach. 1 2 3 4 5 X

C. Math

1. Math also pervades the school day and numerical concepts are related functionally to everything that happens in the classroom. 1 2 3 4 5 X

2. Math is learned through planned activities which are clearly applicable to the "here and now" of the child's world. 1 2 3 4 5 X

3. Math activities include use of manipulative materials such as cuisenaire rods, differentiated by age level and individual competencies.

4. There is continuing practial application in such areas as cooking, block building, field trips, taking attendance, measuring, weighing, care of animals, and in relation to time and space. 1 2 3 4 5 X

5. Specific skills are learned sequentially while gradually exposing the child to more complex concepts and mathematical experiences. 1 2 3 4 5 X

D. Environmental Studies

1.	The curriculum moves from themes of home and school into exploration of the neighborhood and finally the broader environment, in terms of both time and space.	1 2 3 4 5 X
2.	As in other aspects of the curriculum there is a constant tuning in to the child's interest and building with him environmental studies that will seem both important and pleasurable to him.	1 2 3 4 5 X
3.	Trips to the immediate community include exploration of food, housing, transportation, public services, and particularly the people who provide such services.	1 2 3 4 5 X
4.	Environmental studies include both the physical and social sciences as they relate to one another and also in their discrete aspects.	1 2 3 4 5 X
5.	Studies of the physical environment are rich in raw materials, such as water, wind, ice, plants, animals and in experimentation with scientific procedure such as growing plants, feeding animals, and the transformation of ingredients during the cooking process.	1 2 3 4 5 X

E. Art, Music, Dramatic Play

1.	Creative experiences are both planned and spontaneous and like other aspects of the curriculum are integrated into the totality of the child's learning.	1 2 3 4 5 X
2.	Musical activities include rhythm, use of musical	1 2 3 4 5 X

instruments, singing (structured or spontaneous) and listening to music in various forms as played by staff, parents and invited guests as well as through records and tapes.

3. Art is also both spontaneously expressive through finger painting, murals, easel painting, and interpretive of art created by others as seen in books, pictures, museums, displays. 1 2 3 4 5 X

4. Dramatic play is viewed not only as a yalued outlet for the child himself but also as one of the most important diagnostic tools for the adults' insights into children's genuine feelings, anxieties, strengths, and potential for development. 1 2 3 4 5 X

IV. SPONSOR'S DELIVERY SYSTEM*

A. Commitments of Sponsor and Community

1. The Sponsor has developed a theory on Early Childhood Education. The Sponsor has and is developing a practical program for individualization which involves interpretation, stimulation, and staff development to enable the community to put the approach into practice. 1 2 3 4 X

2. The contractual relationship assumes that the community has a genuine interest in the primary schools serving a population of poor children and that it will support the efforts of the sponsor administratively. 1 2 3 4 X

*All categories under Section IV may require interview rather than observation alone.

B. Interpretation and Assistance in Implementation

1.	The Director of the Bank Street program maintains a continuing relationship as both consultant and catalyst in all areas of the program: administrative, educational, supportive services, parent involvement, and community relations.	1 2 3 4 X
2.	An Associate Director coordinates Program Analysis and another Associate Director gives priority to coordinating the Head Start Program.	1 2 3 4 X
3.	The Sponsor assigns a continuing field representative to each project who not only interprets the sponsor's approach but also works with local staff and parents in its implementation.	1 2 3 4 X
4.	The Sponsor provides specialists in specific areas as resource persons on-site and at the College.	1 2 3 4 X
5.	The Sponsor provides interpretive materials such as working papers, curriculum guides, self-study forms, questionnaires, reports, staff evaluational forms, and various media such as films, carousels, videotapes, as well as Bank Street published materials including basal readers, discovery materials and language stimulation materials.	1 2 3 4 X

C. Staff Development

1.	The Sponsor conducts institutes and workshops at Bank Street for Directors, principals and other administrative personnel in the system, staff developers,	1 2 3 4 X

teaching teams, parents ancillary staff.

These institutes include observation of the Demonstration School for Children, visits to N.Y.C. Follow Through program in P.S. 243, and other educational experiments in the New York area as well as seminars, individual consultations and team planning.

2. The Sponsor assists local staff in developing on-site institutes and workshops covering the same type of personnel but including all local individuals in the respective categories. These institutes are held before the school year begins and throughout the year as needed. They cover educational support for each component, assistance in diagnostic teaching with emphasis on psychological, social and parent liaison services as supportive of teaching, and the development of new ways of assessing individual child growth along many dimensions. 1 2 3 4 X

3. There is continuing emphasis upon supporting and extending team work throughout both institutes and consulting services including team work: 1 2 3 4 X
   a) between administrative and program personnel;
   b) between field representatives and staff developers;
   c) between staff developers and teaching teams;
   d) within the teaching team;
   e) between all of the above and ancillary staff; and
   f) with and among parents.

4. The consultant services of field representative, resource 1 2 3 4 X

persons and central Bank Street staff are viewed as an essential component of the circular process of staff development. The Sponsor provides input to the community, considers feedback from the community and eventually plans jointly with the community to meet differentiated needs with continuing support and guidance.

5. The Sponsor organized courses for the teaching personnel and parents with academic credit to further Career Development. 1 2 3 4 X

D. Program Analysis

1. Teachers are using instruments for systematic classroom observation which are designed not only to assess progress toward implementation of the Bank Street Approach but also to strengthen self-analysis and staff development. 1 2 3 4 X

V. PARENT INVOLVEMENT*

A. In Children's Learning

1. Parents are encouraged to participate in the school's learning activities, such as helping with story time, field trips, cooking, and making materials. 1 2 3 4 X

2. Parents who participate are invited to conference with the teaching team so as to share thoughts, feelings and ideas about program and children. 1 2 3 4 X

*All categories under Section V may require interview rather than observation alone.

3. Special skills and talents of parents are searched out and utilized in the classroom, to enrich the curriculum and to enhance the positive feelings about self for both parents and children. 1 2 3 4 X

4. Parent and teacher enter into one-to-one conferencing around the learning needs of each parent's child or children, in which the teacher learns from and with the parent about a specific child. 1 2 3 4 X

5. Parents and teachers cooperate in planning out-of-school reinforcement of what children are doing and learning in school, which is facilitated by home visits by both the teaching teams and ancillary staff. 1 2 3 4 X

6. Parents develop and/or use checklist for classroom observation, i.e., what to look for in a Bank Street-sponsored classroom. 1 2 3 4 X

B. In Decision-Making Through PC (Policy Committee)

1. Parents are involved in decision-making through the appropriate representation and responsibility in policy-making boards. 1 2 3 4 X

2. The nature and scope of such decisions are determined by the extent to which parents understand and participate in the school's program and also by the stage of organization and functioning which the policy board has reached. 1 2 3 4 X

3. Parents are encouraged and assisted when such assistance is desired, in organizing their policy board, in such matters as by-laws, 1 2 3 4 X

contracts, committee structure and program planning.

C. In Self-Development

1. Parents participate in study groups often initiated by parents themselves. 1 2 3 4 X

2. Parents' workshops are designed to further interpretation of the Sponsor's Approach to Early Childhood Education and the school's implementation of the model. 1 2 3 4 X

3. Parents are being trained to interview each other, using the new Questionnaire for Parents. 1 2 3 4 X

4. Parents who have actively involved the above mentioned activities interpret the model and the school's educational goals to other parents. 1 2 3 4 X

5. Parents may enroll in courses for high school equivalency or for undergraduate credit, particularly those who are employed as paraprofessionals. 1 2 3 4 X

D. In School-Related Social Activities

1. Parents plan and conduct social activities for parents themselves. 1 2 3 4 X

2. Parents assist in planning and conducting children's social activities such as end-of-year functions, birthday parties, holiday festivals, which bring the ethnic culture of the child into the school. 1 2 3 4 X

3. In some communities a special room or house may be set aside for the use of parents, which is often used for 1 2 3 4 X

educational and community activities as well as for the primary social function.

E. In Community Action

1.	Parents participate in existing Community Action programs which affect directly or indirectly their children's learnings.	1 2 3 4 X
2.	In some communities the Head Start parents spearhead new programs and create new organizations.	1 2 3 4 X
3.	Head Start parents cooperate with Follow Through parents in the above mentioned activities.	1 2 3 4 X
4.	Parents interpret the program not only to other parents but also to the broader community.	1 2 3 4 X

Appendix B

Essential Components

Date _____

Staff Member _____

January, 1974

BANK STREET

Essential Components

	Yes	Partly	No
1. Materials in the room are used for first hand, direct experiences, such as cooking utensils, blocks, games, paints, clay, rock or shell collections, pets, "props" (e.g., household equipment, clothes for dramatic play, plants, etc. anecdotal evidence:	☐	☐	☐
2. Symbolic representations of direct experience, especially in the form of language, receive a great deal of emphasis (stories, experience charts, and/or paintings about trips, block buildings with labels such as "Jim's building, do not knock down", or "Empire State Building", dramatic play, discussions, books, writing or telling stories to learn about a pet, the aquarium, growing plants, etc.)	☐	☐	☐
3. The child is encouraged to gain control over and connect with his own world by the teacher's familiarity with and utilization of his personal relationships and important individual experiences.	☐	☐	☐

© Anne Coolidge Monaghan/The Huron Institute/1974

4.* The teaching team is aware of how classroom materials and individual equipment have been used by individual children. They use this information for understanding children and planning program development. ☐ ☐ ☐

5. Children's work is displayed prominently and in places where children can see it at close range. ☐ ☐ ☐

6. The teaching team encourages children to engage in the learning process, not by demanding specific responses from specific children, but rather by inviting participation through asking questions, having conversations and showing an active interest in the child. (Some additional parts of this process are adults encouraging expression of feelings and imagination, and warmth and acceptance of the children on the part of adults.) ☐ ☐ ☐

Assumptions

Children learn a great deal from direct experience without any assistance from the adult.

Children's experiences need to be translated into a symbolic form for them to be maximally meaningful.

Teachers need to know individual children in order to plan the adult's contribution to and sequencing of children's experiences in school.

---

*This item is an interview item.

Learning can be increased by providing the proper environment.

Adult observations and impressions of children are an adequate tool for planning children's classroom experiences.

Adult initiated verbal contact with children is a crucial assist to children's learning.